

To: Mandel, Arthur[Arthur.Mandel@mail.house.gov]
From: Plevin, Lisa
Sent: Mon 2/25/2013 1:58:38 PM
Subject: RE: Ffs

Hi Artie. Sorry for delay. Was away.

The reason the FFS was undertaken, even while the RI/FS was being done by the CPG, was to get remediation started earlier in the lower 8 miles where 2/3 of the dioxin or more is located. The lower eight miles contains about 90% of the contaminated fine grain sediments and they are fairly ubiquitous therefore requiring a bank to bank remediation approach.

Here is the key fact: We know the lower 8 will require bank-to-bank remediation (the PRPs disagree), and we therefore know that any appropriate remedy we pick for the lower 8 will be consistent with the remedy ultimately selected for the entire 17-mile river.

The FFS will allow us to pick a remedy for the lower 8 and get it started 3 or more years earlier than if we wait for the entire RI/FS to be completed. Let me know if you have more questions. Lisa

-----Original Message-----

From: Mandel, Arthur [mailto:Arthur.Mandel@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2013 5:33 PM
To: Plevin, Lisa
Subject: Ffs

Hi Lisa- I think you all may be aware but the cpgs are going around in our district touting their own plan and knocking the ffs because it does "nothing for the other 9 miles of the river." I wasn't around back then but do you have a quick and dirty explanation we could share with folks as to why the ffs was broken off from the entire lower Passaic study, why this decision was made and how the two studies complement each other?

Thanks and have a good weekend

-ALM

ÿ